



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Fax Cover Sheet

Date: 24 Apr 2003

To: ROGER LEE, Esq.	From: Chester T. Barry
Application/Control Number: 10/088,234	Art Unit: 1724
Fax No.: 703-836-2021	Phone No.: 703-306-5921
Voice No.: 7038386545	Return Fax No.: 703-872-9310
Re: PCT/FR00/02610 (aka 10/088234)	CC:

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ For Comment ☐ For Reply ☐ Per Your Request

Comments:

6

Number of pages _ including this page

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This facsimile transmission is an Official U.S. Government document which may contain information which is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If this document is received in error, you are requested to immediately notify the sender at the above indicated telephone number and return the entire document in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/088,234

Applicant(s)

PESCHER ET AL.

Examiner

Chester T. Barry

Art Unit

1724

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Chester T. Barry.

(3)_____.

(2) Roger Lee, Reg No. 46317.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 4/22-24/03.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: NONE.

Identification of prior art discussed: NONE (IPER not a P.A. ref.).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

*Fondé
en 1898*

*Founded
in 1898*

C A B I N E T
L A V O I X

Paris :
33 (0)1 53 2
brevets@cabin
marques@cab

Lyon :
33 (0)4 78 6
info@lavoix-ly


Conseils en Propriété Industrielle

Brevets, Marques, Modèles, Droit d'Auteur, Contrats, Litiges
Mandataires en Brevets Européens,
Mandataires en Marques Communautaires.

Industrial Property Attorneys

*Patents, Trademarks, Designs, Copyright,
French and European Patent and Trademark Attorneys.*

Bienvenue sur notre site
Welcome on our site



1898 - 2001

1898 - 2001

1898 - 2001

Plus d'un siècle au cours duquel le **Cabinet Lavoix** a sans cesse :

- affiné ses méthodes d'analyse des inventions, des marques, des créations esthétiques
- modernisé sa gestion des portefeuilles de brevets, marques et modèles de ses clients,
- développé pour ses clients l'information sur les évolutions des systèmes de Propriété Intellectuelle de par le monde.

Le Cabinet Lavoix : le partenaire toujours plus proche et plus efficace des entreprises innovatrices et des créateurs individuels.

More than a century during which **Cabinet Lavoix** has constantly:

- improved its methods for analyzing inventions, trademarks, aesthetic creations;
- updated the management of portfolios of patents, trademarks and designs of its clients;
- developed the information of its clients with regard to the changes of the Intellectual Property systems throughout the world.

Cabinet Lavoix: an ever closer and more efficient partner of innovative firms and individual creators.

Mehr als ein Jahrhundert, in dem die **Cabinet Lavoix** stetig :

- ihre Analysemethoden für Erfindungen, Marken und ästhetische Schöpfungen verfeinert hat,
- ihre Verwaltung von Patenten, Marken und Modellen ihrer Mandanten modernisiert hat,
- ihre Mandanten über die neuesten Entwicklungen des gewerblichen Rechtsschutzes in aller Welt informiert hat.

Cabinet Lavoix : der leistungsfähige und nahestehende Partner von innovativen Unternehmen, Erfindern und Designern.



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Factual Background to the Interview: This application is the US national stage of PCT/FR00/02610 in which an IPER had been mailed to applicants' representative P. Le Coupanec of the firm Cabinet Lavoix. According to the IPER in this case, the IPER was mailed on 20.12.2001 and received at Cabinet Lavoix on 24.12.2001. The IPER, explaining why certain claims were held either not novel or not involving an inventive step, was written in the French language. The three co-applicants are French citizens. Each resides in France. Two reside in Paris. The web site of Cabinet Lavoix (a portion of which <http://www.cabinet-lavoix.com/pages/centenaire.htm> is attached hereto) implies that the firm has competencies in French, English, and German. In the US Office action (paper no. 7), the US examiner adopted the reasons given by the EPO in the IPER for rejecting certain claims under 35 USC §102 and certain other claims under § 103.

Substance of the Interview: Within the period for which a two month extension of time would have been required under US law and/or regulation in order to file a timely response to the 18.12.2002 Office action (incidentally, at a cost of \$410), on 22.04.2003 Mr. Lee requested a) an English translation of the French language IPER, b) fuller exposition of the examiner's position in English, and c) a new non-final Office action. Mr. Lee is a registered practitioner (RN 46317) not of record. The examiner stated he would not do so because the shortened statutory period for response had expired. After Mr. Lee contacted the examiner's supervisor (Tom Dunn) and after the supervisor and the examiner discussed Mr. Lee's request, the examiner telephoned Mr. Lee on 4/24/03 to inform him that the Office would issue a new non-final Office. No response to the previously-mailed action (paper no. 7) is required.

Postscript to the Interview: The requirement that the applicant provide a written summary of the interview is not waived (see 37 CFR 1.133), but applicants' summary of this interview needn't be filed until a reply to the next Office action is filed. A copy of this interview summary was faxed to Mr. Lee on 4/24/03. A new non-final Office action on the merits will be mailed in due course.

The Office deeply regrets the apparent inconvenience to applicants by having communicated the PTO's position on the merits in French, a language that appears to be their native language.